

**2008 Columbia Basin Fish Accords
Memorandum of Agreement between the
State of Idaho and FCRPS Action Agencies**

IDAHO-ACTION AGENCY MOA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. HYDRO COMMITMENTS.....	1
A. Hydro Performance.....	1
A.1. Performance Standards, Targets, and Metrics:.....	1
A.2. Performance and Adaptive Management:.....	2
A.3. Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation.....	2
B. Spill/Transport.....	2
C. Dam Breaching.....	3
D. Flow Actions.....	3
E. Emergency Operations for Unlisted Fish.....	3
III. HABITAT AND HATCHERY COMMITMENTS.....	3
A. BPA Funding for Habitat.....	3
A.1. General Principles:.....	3
A.2. Types of Projects.....	3
B. Funding for Hatchery Actions.....	4
B.1. General Principles:.....	4
B.2. Expense and Capital Hatchery Actions:.....	4
C. General Provisions For All Projects.....	4
D. Council and ISRP Review.....	5
E. Replacement Projects and Adaptive Management.....	6
E.1. General Principles:.....	6
E.2. Replacement Projects:.....	7
E.3. Adaptive Management.....	7
F. Inflation, Ramp Up, Planning v. Actuals, Carry-over:.....	7
F.1. Inflation.....	7
F.2. Treatment of Ramp-up of new/expanded work:.....	7
F.3. Assumptions regarding Planning versus Actuals.....	7
F.4. Unspent funds, and pre-scheduling/rescheduling.....	8
IV. FORBEARANCE, WITHDRAWAL, AND.....	9
A. Effects on Litigation.....	9
B. Affirmation of Adequacy.....	10
C. Council Program Amendment Process and Other Provisions.....	11
D. Good Faith Implementation and Support.....	11
E. Changed Circumstances, Renegotiation/Modification, Withdrawal.....	12
F. Dispute Resolution.....	13
F.1. Negotiation.....	13
F.2. Mediation.....	14
G. Modification.....	14
V. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.....	14
A. Term of Agreement.....	14

IDAHO-ACTION AGENCY MOA

B.	Applicable Law	14
C.	Authority	14
D.	Effective Date & Counterparts.....	15
E.	Binding Effect.....	15
H.	Waiver, <i>Force Majeure</i> , Availability of Funds	15
I.	Notice	15
J.	List of Attachments.....	16

IDAHO-ACTION AGENCY MOA

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE STATE OF IDAHO, THE BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION, THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, AND THE U.S. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

I. INTRODUCTION

The Bonneville Power Administration ("BPA"), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ("Corps") and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation ("Reclamation") (collectively, "Action Agencies") and the State of Idaho ("Idaho" or "State") have developed this Memorandum of Agreement ("Agreement" or "MOA") through good faith negotiations to address for the term of the Agreement issues associated with the direct and indirect effects of construction, inundation, operation and maintenance of the Federal Columbia River Power System ("FRCPS")¹ and Reclamation's Upper Snake River ("Upper Snake") Projects,² on the fish and wildlife resources of the Columbia River Basin. The Action Agencies and Idaho intend to provide for a long-term agreement that provides benefits to all the Parties. Specific reasons for this Agreement include the following:

- To address legal mandates for the FCRPS and Upper Snake Projects under the Endangered Species Act ("ESA"), the Northwest Power Act ("NPA"), and the Clean Water Act ("CWA").
- To address the Parties' mutual concerns for certainty and stability in the funding and implementation of projects for the benefit of fish and wildlife affected by the FCRPS and Upper Snake Projects, affirming and adding to the actions proposed in the draft FCRPS and Upper Snake Biological Opinions ("BiOps"); and
- To foster a cooperative and partnership-like relationship in implementation of the mutual commitments in this Agreement

II. HYDRO COMMITMENTS

A. Hydro Performance

A.1. Performance Standards, Targets, and Metrics:

Idaho concurs in use of the hydro performance standards, targets, and metrics as described in the Main Report, Section 2.1.2.2 of the Action Agencies' August 2007

¹ For purposes of this Agreement, the FCRPS comprises 14 Federal multipurpose hydropower projects. The 12 projects operated and maintained by the Corps are: Bonneville, the Dalles, John Day, McNary, Chief Joseph, Albeni Falls, Libby, Ice Harbor, Lower Monumental, Little Goose, Lower Granite, and Dworshak dams. Reclamation operates and maintains the following FCRPS projects: Hungry Horse Project and Columbia Basin Project, which includes Grand Coulee Dam.

² For purposes of this Agreement, the Upper Snake River Projects (Upper Snake) are Minidoka, Palisades, Michaud Flats, Ririe, Little Wood River, Boise, Lucky Peak, Mann Creek, Owyhee, Vale, Burnt River and Baker.

IDAHO-ACTION AGENCY MOA

FCRPS Biological Assessment (FCRPS BA)(pages 2-3 through 2-6) and the draft FCRPS BiOp at RPA 51 (pages 63-64 of 85). Idaho and its representatives may recommend to the Action Agencies actions that may exceed performance standards, which will be considered and may be implemented at the discretion of the Action Agencies.

A.2 Performance and Adaptive Management:

The Parties agree that the BiOps will employ an adaptive management approach, including reporting and diagnosis, as described in Section 2.1 of the Action Agencies' FCRPS BA. The Parties agree that if biological or project performance expectations as described in the FCRPS BA are not being met over time as anticipated, diagnosis will be done to identify causes, and remedies will be developed to meet the established performance standard. The performance standard for species or the federal projects will not be lowered during the terms of the BiOps (although as provided in the FCRPS BA, tradeoffs among Snake River and lower Columbia River federal dams are allowed). The Parties recognize that new biological information will be available during the term of this Agreement that will inform the methods and assumptions used to analyze the effects of hydro operations on fish species covered by this Agreement. The Parties will work together to seek agreement on methods and assumptions for such analyses building on analyses performed in development of the FCRPS BiOp as warranted.

As described in the draft FCRPS BiOp, a comprehensive review will be completed in June 2012 and June 2015 that includes a review of the state of implementation of all actions planned or anticipated in the FCRPS and Upper Snake BiOps and a review of the status and performance of each ESU addressed by those BiOps. The Parties agree that they will jointly discuss the development, analyses and recommendations related to these comprehensive evaluations and, in the event performance is not on track, to discuss options for corrective action.

A.3. Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation.

Maintaining and improving research, monitoring, and evaluation programs is critical to informed decision making on population status assessments and improving management action effectiveness. The Parties agree that the program of research, monitoring, and evaluation provided in the draft FCRPS and Upper Snake BiOps and this Agreement provide a comprehensive RM&E program that addresses critical uncertainties. The Action Agencies will implement status and effectiveness research, monitoring and evaluation sufficient to robustly track survival improvements and facilitate rebuilding actions accomplished, in part, through projects and programs identified in the FCRPS BA and the draft BiOp. The Parties further agree that the Action Agency effort should be coordinated with implementation partners including other fishery managers.

B. Spill/Transport

The Parties agree that the spill and fish transportation measures proposed in the draft BiOps, subject to adaptive management as provided in the FCRPS BA, satisfy ESA and

IDAHO-ACTION AGENCY MOA

NPA requirements with respect to salmon and steelhead affected by the FCRPS and Upper Snake Projects.

C. Dam Breaching

Idaho supports the adequacy of the combined package of the BiOps and this Agreement, and therefore agrees that breaching some or all of the Snake River FCRPS dams is not necessary to satisfy the ESA, NPA or CWA.

D. Flow Actions

The Parties agree to the flow and water management actions in the draft FCRPS and Upper Snake BiOps and further recognize the need for such actions to be consistent with the Snake River Water Rights Act of 2004, Pub. L. No. 108-447, Div. J, Tit. X, 118 Stat. 2809, 3431. In particular, concerning the relationship between the FCRPS BiOp and the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program and Mainstem Amendments with respect to Hungry Horse and Libby Dams, the Parties support implementing the Water Management strategies for *Summer reservoir operations at Hungry Horse and Libby, Grand Coulee and Dworshak Dams* contained in the Council's Mainstem Amendments to the Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program as to such Montana facilities.

E. Emergency Operations for Unlisted Fish

The Action Agencies agree to take reasonable actions to aid non-listed fish during brief periods of time due to unexpected equipment failures or other conditions and when significant detrimental biological effects are demonstrated. Where there is a conflict in such operations, operations for ESA-listed fish will take priority.

III. HABITAT AND HATCHERY COMMITMENTS

A. BPA Funding for Habitat

A.1 General Principles:

- Habitat projects funded under this Agreement are linked to biological benefits based on limiting factors for ESA-listed fish. See Attachment B.
- Projects funded under this Agreement are consistent with recovery plans and subbasin plans now included in the Council's Program. More specific linkages will be documented as a function of the BPA contracting process.
- Projects may be modified by mutual agreement over time based on biological priorities, feasibility, science review comments, or accountability for results.

A.2 Types of Projects

BPA is committing to funding a suite of projects and activities that are summarized in Attachment A. The projects or actions are all designed to address ESA-listed salmon and

IDAHO-ACTION AGENCY MOA

steelhead, in support of the draft FCRPS BiOp and Council program implementation in Idaho.

B. Funding for Hatchery Actions

B.1. General Principles:

- BPA's funding will be in addition to and not replace funding for hatcheries provided by other entities, including but not limited to funding provided by Congress pursuant to the Mitchell Act,
- If the hatchery action identified in Attachment A is not able to be implemented as originally proposed but the need for the hatchery to meet FCRPS BiOp commitments remain, BPA and Idaho will seek a replacement in accordance with the principles in Section III.E below. Otherwise, if the hatchery action identified in Attachment A is not able to be implemented, the Action Agencies are not obligated to fund a replacement or alternative project. Unused hatchery funds may be shifted to non-hatchery projects only upon the Parties' mutual agreement.

B.2. Expense and Capital Hatchery Actions:

BPA will make available funding for a sockeye conservation hatchery (new facility construction and/or expansions of existing facilities), as described in Attachment A. Most of this funding is anticipated to qualify as capital funding. The remaining amount is anticipated to be expense funding to provide for planning expenses or other non-capital activities associated with hatchery design, construction, and implementation. Starting with the FY 2010 rate period, BPA will collaborate with Idaho to develop a capital spending plan in advance of each new rate period that arises during the Agreement, so as to ensure that adequate rate period capital budgets are available for funding the capital actions in this Agreement.

C. General Provisions For All Projects

C.1. All projects funded pursuant to this Agreement shall:

- Be consistent with the Council's Program (including sub-basin plans), as amended, otherwise compliant with the NPA's science and other review processes; applicable ESA recovery plans; and applicable data management protocols adopted by the Action Agencies.
- For BPA funded commitments, be consistent with BPA's then applicable policies, including but not limited to BPA's *in lieu* policy and BPA's capital policy.
- For BPA funded commitments, report results annually (including ongoing agreed upon monitoring and evaluation) via PISCES and/or other appropriate databases.
- Remain in substantive compliance with any applicable project contract terms.

IDAHO-ACTION AGENCY MOA

C.2. In addition, for non-hatchery projects identified as providing benefits to listed ESA fish, Idaho shall:

- provide estimated habitat quality improvement and survival benefits from the project to a population or populations of listed salmon and steelhead based on key limiting factors;
- identify these benefits based on expert determination; and
- support and defend these estimates of habitat improvement and survival benefits with scientific, policy, and legal arguments.

C.3. In addition, for hatchery projects, Idaho shall, prior to capital funding:

- Identify the biological benefits associated with a hatchery project based on expert determination and will support and defend these estimates of biological benefits;
- Obtain a NOAA determination that the hatchery project will not impede and where possible will contribute to recovery.
- Secure or assist in securing all necessary permits for hatchery construction and operation.

C.4. The Parties will coordinate their RM&E projects with each other and with regional RM&E processes (particularly those needed to ensure consistency with the FCRPS BiOp RM&E framework), as appropriate and agreed to among the Parties.

C.5. For actions on federal lands, Idaho will consult with the federal land managers and obtain necessary permits and approvals.

D. Council and ISRP Review

D.1. As described in Section III.C.1, above, all projects funded by BPA pursuant to this Agreement must be consistent with the Council's Program and follow the NPA's science and other review processes. The Parties agree that, subject to Section III.C.1, BPA funding commitments in this Agreement and the associated projects to be implemented by Idaho are consistent with the Council's Program.

D.2. The Parties recognize that the Council's Program is a maturing program, which through several decades of implementation has established a continuing framework for mitigating the impacts of hydroelectric development in the Columbia River Basin. The Parties acknowledge that nothing in this Agreement precludes any Party from making recommendations to the Council about modifications to the Council or ISRP review processes to facilitate project implementation under this Agreement or generally.

D.3. The Parties further acknowledge Idaho's desire to not include ongoing projects in this Agreement, with the exception of those ongoing projects contained in Attachment A that are being expanded "Ongoing projects" means projects proposed by Idaho, recommended by the Council, and funded by BPA during the FY 07-09 period pursuant

IDAHO-ACTION AGENCY MOA

to BPA's FY 07-09 programmatic fish and wildlife decisions.³ The Action Agencies agree that this Agreement does not preclude Idaho from seeking funds to continue such ongoing projects or for new projects through the Council's Program and that all requests for such funds will be considered by BPA in accordance with the NPA. Requests for such funds shall not be predicated, or otherwise justified, in whole or part on grounds inconsistent with the forbearance and adequacy commitments in Section IV.A and B. As a result, the Parties acknowledge that Idaho may continue to seek funding for ongoing or new projects from BPA pursuant to the NPA for habitat, hatchery, and research, monitoring and evaluation (RM&E) activities to protect, mitigate, and enhance resident fish and terrestrial life inside and outside the anadromous zone in Idaho. The Parties recognize that any questions over the applicability of this Agreement to projects concerned with resident fish in the anadromous zone, to the extent that a project may affect anadromous fish, will be resolved in accordance with Section IV.F. Idaho also may continue to seek funding for ongoing or new projects from BPA in addition to funding provided pursuant to this Agreement for habitat, hatchery, or RM&E activities to protect, mitigate, and enhance anadromous fish in the anadromous zone, and BPA shall comply with applicable NPA requirements in determining whether to fund such requests; provided that, as provided in the forbearance and adequacy provisions in Section IV.A and B, any such funding determinations shall not be subject to judicial or other challenge.

E. Replacement Projects and Adaptive Management

E.1. General Principles:

- This section does not apply to hatchery projects unless, as described above, the original proposed hatchery action is not able to be implemented but the need for hatchery to meet FCRPS BiOp commitments remains.
- The Parties agree that a project identified in this Agreement may not ultimately be implemented or completed due to a variety of possible factors, including but not limited to:
 - Problems arising during regulatory compliance (e.g., ESA consultation, NEPA, NHPA review, CWA permit compliance, etc);
 - The project does not meet BPA's in lieu policy or does not meet BPA's capital policy;
 - New information regarding the biological benefits of the project (e.g., new information indicating a different implementation action is of higher priority, or monitoring or evaluation indicates the project is not producing its anticipated benefits);
 - Changed circumstances (e.g., completion of the original project or inability to implement the project due to environmental conditions); or
 - Substantive non-compliance with the implementing contract.

³ The ongoing projects are: BPA Project Nos. 198806500, 198909800, 199005500, 199107200, 199107300, 199202603, 199206100, 199206103, 199303501, 199401500, 199404700, 199505700, 199505701, 199608600, 199700100, 199800200, 200002800, 200700300, 200717000, 200733200, 200739400, 200739900, 200740200, 200740300, and 200799000.

IDAHO-ACTION AGENCY MOA

- Should a project not be implemented due to one or more of the above factors, the Action Agency and Idaho will promptly negotiate a replacement project.

E.2. Replacement Projects:

- A replacement project should be the same or similar to the one it replaces in terms of target species, limiting factor, mitigation approach, geographic area and/or subbasin and biological benefits.
- A replacement project will not require additional Council or ISRP review if the original project has been reviewed.
- A replacement project should have the same or similar planning budget as the one it replaces (less any expenditures made for the original project). Such budget must address carry-forward funding whose amount and calculation will be subject to the Parties' mutual agreement.

E.3. Adaptive Management

In addition to project-specific adaptation described above, the Parties may mutually agree to adaptively manage this shared implementation portfolio on a more programmatic scale based on new information or changed circumstances.

F. Inflation, Ramp Up, Planning v. Actuals, Carry-over:

F.1. Inflation.

Beginning in fiscal year (FY) 2010, BPA will provide an annual inflation adjustment of 2.5 percent.

F.2. Treatment of Ramp-up of new/expanded work:

In recognition of the need to “ramp up” work (timing of Agreement execution, contracting, permitting, etc), the Parties agree that average BPA spending for the new/expanded projects in fiscal year 2008 is expected to be approximately one-third of the average planning level shown for the project in Attachment A; and for fiscal year 2009, it is expected to be up to 75 percent of the average planning level shown for the project in Attachment A, with full planning levels expected for the projects in Attachment A starting in fiscal year 2010.

F.3. Assumptions regarding Planning versus Actuals

Historically, the long-term average difference between BPA’s planned expenditures for implementing the expense component of the Power Council’s Fish and Wildlife Program, and actual spending (what BPA is invoiced and pays under the individual contracts), has been about seven percent, with the actual spending averaging 93 percent of planned spending. While BPA will plan for spending up to 100 percent of the funding commitments described in this Agreement, nevertheless, due to a variety of factors,

IDAHO-ACTION AGENCY MOA

BPA's actual expenditures may be less. As a result, the Parties agree that provided BPA's actual spending for the totality of project commitments in this Agreement averages 93 percent of the planning amount annually, BPA is in compliance with its funding commitments. If BPA is not meeting the 93 percent average annually due to circumstances beyond the Parties' control, BPA will not be in violation of this Agreement, but the Parties will meet to discuss possible actions to remove the impediments to achieving 93 percent. The Parties also agree that, for the reasons given above regarding ramp up, new projects and projects expansions during their FY08 and FY09 ramp up phase will be excluded from this calculation.

F.4. Unspent funds, and pre-scheduling/rescheduling.

Annual project budgets may fluctuate plus or minus 20 percent in relation to the planning budgets for each project, to allow for shifts in work between years (within the scope of the project overall), if work will take longer to perform for reasons beyond the sponsors' control (reschedule), or can potentially be moved to an earlier time (preschedule). Fluctuations within an overall project's scope of work, but outside of the 20 percent band, can also occur if mutually agreeable for reasons such as, but not limited to, floods, fires, or other *force majeure* events.

Generally speaking, unspent project funds that are carried over per the reschedule/preschedule provisions above (i.e., within +/- 20 percent of the annual project budget and within the project's scope of work) may be carried forward from one contract year (i.e., Year 1), to as far as two contract years (i.e., Year 3) into the future before such funds are no longer available. There are two exceptions to this reschedule/preschedule criteria and the limitation on carry-forward.

First, as an additional limitation on carry-forward, for project expansions and new projects (which describes all the projects in Attachment A), if actual total FY08 and FY09 spending is less than the sum of 33 percent of the FY08 budget and up to 75 percent of the FY09 budgets reflected in Attachment A for the project due to circumstances within Idaho's control, then the difference between what is actually spent in FY08 and FY09, and the sum of 33 percent of the FY08 budget and up to 75 percent of the FY09 budgets reflected in the spreadsheet, cannot be carried over into FY10.

Second, to the extent that the projects proposed for funding in this Agreement involve the acquisition of interests in land or water from willing sellers, BPA and Idaho may, by mutual agreement, adjust the 20 percent fluctuation band for the budgets for such projects to accommodate the uncertainties of negotiations with sellers. In addition, BPA may extend the two year carry-forward limit for such projects, provided that Idaho provides at least six months notice of the potential need for such an extension, and provided further that BPA may decline to extend the carry-forward limit to avoid a "bow wave" of spending in any given year, or towards the end of this Agreement's term, or on any other reasonable ground.

IV. FORBEARANCE, WITHDRAWAL, AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION

A. Effects on Litigation

A.1. The Parties will discuss the appropriate means of alerting the district court in *NWF v. NMFS* of this Agreement (if needed) and will undertake any agreed-upon approach within 14 calendar days of the effective date of this Agreement.

A.2. Idaho covenants that during the term of this Agreement:

a. Idaho will not initiate, intervene in, or support in any manner ESA, NPA, CWA, or Administrative Procedure Act ("APA") suits against the Action Agencies or NOAA regarding the legal sufficiency of the FCRPS proposed action, FCRPS BiOp, Upper Snake BiOp and/or conforming implementing Records of Decision (RODs) absent consent of all federal defendants.

b. Idaho will not initiate, intervene in, or support in any manner ESA, NPA, CWA or APA suits against the Action Agencies or NOAA regarding the effects on fish resources or water quality resulting from the operations or existence of the FCRPS and Upper Snake Projects that are specifically addressed in the FCRPS PA, FCRPS BiOp, Upper Snake BiOp and/or conforming implementing RODs absent consent of all federal defendants. Water quality for purposes of this provision includes only water temperature and total dissolved gas requirements and therefore excludes all other matters, such as (by way of illustration and not limitation) the Corps' program under 33 U.S.C. § 1344 and toxics clean up regulation. Nothing in this Agreement, including without limitation Section II.D regarding flow and water management, shall preclude Idaho from enforcing, to the extent permitted by federal law, the provisions of state water quality statutes, currently the Idaho Environmental Protection and Health Act (Idaho Code §§ 39-101 to -175C) and the Idaho Water Quality Act (Idaho Code §§ 39-3601 to -3639), or rules promulgated under such statutes, with respect to any effect from the operation the FCRPS and Upper Snake Projects, except effects on total dissolved gas or water temperature when an FCRPS Project is operated consistently with the draft FCRPS BiOp.

c. Idaho's participation in ongoing and future BPA rate proceedings (ratemaking, approval, or review) will be consistent with the terms of this Agreement.

d. Idaho shall not advocate against, either directly or through parties not subject to the Agreement, the adequacy of the FCRPS and Upper Snake BiOps and the Action Agencies' implementation of the BiOps and this Agreement. The term "advocate" does not include (1) reporting data or results from projects or activities that have been undertaken pursuant to, or are otherwise consistent with, this Agreement; or (2) producing or testifying concerning such data or results when compelled by law to do so—e.g., by virtue of judicial process or compliance with state public record statutes.

IDAHO-ACTION AGENCY MOA

e. These commitments apply to state agencies, boards, commissions or other Executive Branch entities, and any person that acts as an agent or representative of same. Subject to Section IV.C.3, the Parties agree that Idaho's appointees to the Council are excluded from the obligations under this Agreement to the extent that such exclusion is necessary to enable Idaho's appointees to perform their responsibilities under the NPA.

B. Affirmation of Adequacy

B.1. This Agreement builds upon and expands the commitments of the Action Agencies called for in the FCRPS and Upper Snake BiOps. The Parties support this package of federal and Agreement actions as an adequate combined response of these entities to address the government's duties to mitigate for the FCRPS effects under applicable environmental laws and regulations for the ten year duration of the BiOps. This includes requirements for:

- conserving listed salmon and steelhead, including avoiding jeopardy and adverse modification of critical habitat under the ESA;
- protection, mitigation, enhancement and equitable treatment of fish and wildlife under the NPA; and
- CWA provisions related to water temperature and total dissolved gas requirements for FCRPS dams to the extent compliant with the draft FCRPS BiOp and subject to the enforcement authority retained in Section IV.A.2.b.

B.2. Idaho further agrees that the Action Agencies' commitments under this Agreement and the BiOps as to hatchery projects are adequate for 30 years from the effective date of this Agreement, except that after year 15 of the 30 year forbearance for hatcheries, there is a change in the status of an evolutionarily significant unit (e.g., a new listing) or if after year 15 there is new information or changed circumstances that indicate additional hatchery actions are needed to assist in mitigating impacts of the FCRPS consistent with current science and applicable law, Idaho is not precluded from seeking additional funding from the Action Agencies for hatcheries. This commitment continues beyond termination of this Agreement's other provisions on September 30, 2018.

B.3. Idaho's determination of adequacy under applicable law is premised on several important assumptions and understandings with which the federal parties to this Agreement concur:

- The specific actions identified in this Agreement are carried out and/or funding for such actions is provided by the federal parties in a timely manner;
- Other actions not specifically identified in this Agreement, but committed to in the FCRPS BiOp are carried out in a timely manner;
- The biological performance and status of the species affected by the development and operation of the FCRPS and Upper Snake hydroprojects are diligently and comprehensively monitored and analyzed, and reported to Idaho and others as provided the BiOps; and

IDAHO-ACTION AGENCY MOA

- Adaptive management will be used as described in the section 2.1 of the Action Agencies' FCRPS BA to ensure achievement of performance objectives for the FCRPS.

C. Council Program Amendment Process and Other Provisions

C.1. During the term of the Agreement, the Parties will submit comments or recommendations for Council Program amendments that are consistent with and are intended to effectuate this Agreement.

C.2. If third parties recommend an amendment to the Program that any Party believes is contrary to this Agreement, the Party is not precluded by the terms of this Agreement from asserting any arguments it may have as to whether such an amendment is lawful or unlawful under the NPA, or any other law, provided in so doing they act consistent with the terms of this Agreement.

C.3. Idaho's Council representatives participated in the development of this Agreement. Nothing in the Agreement, however, is intended to affect, or shall be construed as affecting, consideration by such representatives of recommendations from parties other than Idaho when discharging their duties under the NPA. Similarly, nothing in this Agreement is intended to affect, or shall be construed as affecting, the Action Agencies' rights under Section IV.E with respect to withdrawal or Section IV.F with respect to dispute resolution in the event that the Council takes action inconsistent with Idaho's commitments under this Agreement.

D. Good Faith Implementation and Support

Best effort good-faith implementation and support of this Agreement is the general duty to which all Parties agree to be bound. Nonetheless, the Parties understand that from time to time questions or concerns may arise regarding a Party's compliance with the terms of this Agreement. In furtherance of the continuing duty of good faith, each Party agrees that the following specific actions or efforts will be carried out:

D.1. On a continuing basis, it will take steps to ensure that all levels of their government/institution is made aware of the existence of this Agreement and the specific commitments and obligations herein, and emphasize the importance of meeting them;

D.2. Each Party will designate a person to be initially and chiefly responsible for coordinating internal questions regarding compliance with the Agreement;

D.3. Each Party will make best efforts to consult with other Parties prior to taking any action that could reasonably be interpreted as inconsistent with any part of this Agreement. To assist in this, the Parties will designate initial contact points. The formality and nature of the consultation will likely vary depending circumstances. The initial contact points are initially charged with attempting to agree on what form of consultation is required. In some instances, the contact between initial contact points

IDAHO-ACTION AGENCY MOA

may suffice for the consultation, while in others, they may need to recommend additional steps. The Parties agree that consultations should be as informal and with the least amount of process necessary to ensure that the Parties are fulfilling the good-faith obligation to implement and support the Agreement.

D.4. If a Party believes that another Party has taken action that contrary to the terms of the Agreement, or may take such action, it has the option of a raising a point of concern with other Parties asking for a consultation to clarify or redress the matter. The Parties will endeavor to agree upon any actions that may be required to redress the point of concern. If after raising a point of concern and having a consultation the Parties are unable to agree that the matter has been satisfactorily resolved, any Party may take remedial actions as it deems appropriate, so long as those remedial actions do not violate the terms of the Agreement.

E. Changed Circumstances, Renegotiation/Modification, Withdrawal

E.1. The Parties assume that NOAA will issue final BiOps for the FCRPS and Upper Snake whose provisions, including any reasonable and prudent alternative, will be consistent with the draft BiOps insofar as material to this Agreement. If a Party believes that a material difference exists between the draft and final BiOps for either the FCRPS or Upper Snake, the provisions of Section E.3 apply.

E.2 If any court, regardless of appeal, finds that the BiOp or agency action is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, and subsequently remands the BiOp to NOAA Fisheries this Agreement shall remain in force. If any court, regardless of appeal finds that the BiOp or agency action is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, the Parties will seek to preserve this Agreement, and will meet promptly to determine the appropriate response as described below:

(a) In the event that a portion(s) of this Agreement is in direct conflict with the court order or resulting amended BiOp, the Parties shall meet and agree on an appropriate amendment to that section, or, if such amendment is not possible under the terms of the court order or resulting amended BiOp, then a substitute provision shall be negotiated by the Parties.

(b) If the court-ordered FCRPS operations or resulting amended BiOp require additional actions that are either financially material to an Action Agency or that materially constrain the Corps or Reclamation from meeting FCRPS purposes, Section IV.E.5 shall apply.

(c) The Parties will participate in any court-ordered process or remand consultation in concert with Sections IV.D and IV.E.

(d) The Parties intend that determinations of materiality will only be made in cases of great consequence.

E.3. In the event of the occurrence of any of the material effects in Section E.2, or in the event of material non-compliance with the Agreement not resolved by dispute resolution,

IDAHO-ACTION AGENCY MOA

the affected Party or Parties shall notify the other Parties immediately and identify why the event is considered material. The Parties shall utilize dispute resolution if there is a disagreement as to whether the event is material. In addition, prior to any withdrawal, the Parties shall first make a good faith effort to renegotiate mutually agreeable modifications to the Agreement. If renegotiation is not successful, the affected Party may notify the other Parties in writing of its intent to withdraw by a date certain. If renegotiation is not successful, at the time the withdrawal is effective, all funding commitments and/or other covenants made by the withdrawing Party cease, and the withdrawing Party shall have no further rights or obligations pursuant to the Agreement. A withdrawing Party reserves any existing legal rights under applicable statutes, including all arguments and defenses, and this Agreement cannot be used as an admission or evidence in support of or against any such argument or defense.

E.4. The provisions of this Agreement authorizing renegotiation, dispute resolution and withdrawal provide the sole remedies available to the Parties for remedying changed circumstances or disputes arising out of or relating to implementation of this Agreement.

E.5. Any Party may request renegotiation or withdraw for reasons other than those enumerated above subject, however, to the provisions in Section IV.E.3.

E.6. If one Party withdraws from the Agreement, any other Party has the option to withdraw as well, with prior notice.

E.7. Savings. Notwithstanding Section IV.E.3, in the event of withdrawal, BPA will continue providing funding for projects necessary for support of BiOp commitments (as determined by the Action Agencies), and may provide funding for other on-going projects or programs that the Parties mutually agree are important to continue.

F. Dispute Resolution

F.1. Negotiation

1.a. The Parties shall attempt in good faith to resolve any dispute arising out of or relating to implementation of this Agreement in accordance with this section and without resort to administrative, judicial or other formal dispute resolution procedures. The purpose of this Section IV.F.1 is to provide the Parties an opportunity to fully and candidly discuss and resolve disputes without the expense, risk and delay of a formal dispute resolution.

1.b. If the Parties are unable to resolve the dispute through informal dispute resolution, then the dispute shall be elevated to negotiating between executives and/or officials who have authority to settle the controversy and who are at a higher level of management than the person with direct responsibility for administration of this Agreement. All reasonable requests for information made by one Party to the other will be honored, with the Action Agencies treating “reasonable” within the context of what would be released under the Freedom of Information Act.

IDAHO-ACTION AGENCY MOA

I.c. In the event a dispute over material non-compliance with the Agreement has not been resolved by negotiation, the affected Party may seek to withdraw, without further renegotiation, in accordance with Section IV.E.3.

F.2. Mediation

In the event the dispute has not been resolved by negotiation as provided herein, the disputing Parties may agree to participate in mediation, using a mutually agreed upon mediator. To the extent that the disputing Parties seeking mediation do not already include all Parties to this Agreement, the disputing Parties shall notify the other Parties to this Agreement of the mediation. The mediator will not render a decision, but will assist the disputing Parties in reaching a mutually satisfactory agreement. The disputing Parties agree to share equally the costs of the mediation.

G. Modification

The Parties by mutual agreement may modify the terms of this Agreement. Any such modification shall be in writing signed by all Parties.

V. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

A. Term of Agreement

The term of this Agreement will extend from its effective date through the end of fiscal year 2018 which is midnight on September 30, 2018.

B. Applicable Law

All activities undertaken pursuant to this Agreement must be in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. No provision of this Agreement will be interpreted or constitute a commitment or requirement that the Action Agencies take action in contravention of law, including the APA, ESA, CWA, National Environmental Policy Act, Federal Advisory Committee Act, Information Quality Act, or any other procedural or substantive law or regulation. Federal law shall govern the implementation of this Agreement and any action, whether mediated or not.

C. Authority

Each Party to this Agreement represents and acknowledges that it has full legal authority to execute this Agreement.

IDAHO-ACTION AGENCY MOA

D. Effective Date & Counterparts

The effective date of this Agreement shall be the date of execution by the last Party to provide an authorized signature to this Agreement. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, each of which is deemed to be an executed original even if all signatures do not appear on the same counterpart. Facsimile and photo copies of this Agreement will have the same force and effect as an original.

E. Binding Effect

This Agreement shall be binding on the Parties and their assigns and successors. Each Party may seek dispute resolution in accordance with Section IV.F, or to withdraw in accordance with Section IV.E.3 if the dispute is not resolved.

F. No third party beneficiaries are intended by this Agreement.

G. All previous communications between the Parties, either verbal or written, with reference to the subject matter of this Agreement are superseded, and this Agreement duly accepted and approved constitutes the entire Agreement between the Parties.

H. Waiver, Force Majeure, Availability of Funds

H.1. The failure of any Party to require strict performance of any provision of this Agreement or a Party's waiver of performance shall not be a waiver of any future performance of or a Party's right to require strict performance in the future.

H.2. No Party shall be required to perform due to any cause beyond its control. This may include, but is not limited to fire, flood, terrorism, strike or other labor disruption, act of God or riot. The Party whose performance is affected by a *force majeure* will notify the other Parties as soon as practicable of its inability to perform, and will make all reasonable efforts to promptly resume performance once the *force majeure* is eliminated. If the force majeure cannot be eliminated or addressed, the Party may consider withdrawal pursuant to Section IV.E.3.

H.3 The actions of the Corps and Reclamation set forth in this Agreement are subject to the availability of appropriated funds. Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to require the obligation or disbursement of funds in violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act.

I. Notice

I.1. Any notice permitted or required by the Good Faith provisions of this Agreement, Section IV.D, may be transmitted by e-mail or telephone to a Party's initial contact points, as that person is defined pursuant to the Good Faith provisions.

IDAHO-ACTION AGENCY MOA

I.2. All other notices permitted or required by this Agreement shall be in writing, delivered personally to the persons listed below, or shall be deemed given five (5) days after deposit in the United States mail, addressed as follows, or at such other address as any Party may from time to time specify to the other Parties in writing. Notices may be delivered by facsimile or other electronic means, provided that they are also delivered personally or by mail. The addresses listed below can be modified at any time through written notification to the other Parties.

Notices to BPA should be sent to:

Vice President, Environment Fish & Wildlife
Mail Stop KE-4
Bonneville Power Administration
P.O. Box 3621
Portland, OR 97208-3621

Notices to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers should be sent to:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Northwestern Division
Chief, Planning, Environmental Resources and Fish Policy Support Division
1125 NW Couch Street
Suite 500
P.O. Box 2870
Portland, OR 97208-2870

Notices to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation should be sent to:

Deputy Regional Director
Bureau of Reclamation
Pacific Northwest Region
1150 N. Curtis Rd., Suite 100
Boise, ID 83706

Notices to the State of Idaho should be sent to:

Administrator
Office of Species Conservation
300 North 6th Street, Suite 101
Boise, ID 83702

J. List of Attachments

Attachment A—BPA Funding for Idaho projects for FCRPS BiOp MOA (spreadsheet)
Attachment B—Narrative description and benefits of projects

IDAHO-ACTION AGENCY MOA

SIGNATURES

/s/ Stephen J. Wright

May 2, 2008

Stephen J. Wright
Administrator and Chief Executive Officer
Bonneville Power Administration

Date

/s/ Steven R. Miles, P.E.

May 2, 2008

Steven R. Miles, P.E.
Colonel, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Division Commander

Date

/s/ Tim Personius

May 2, 2008

(for) J. William MacDonald
Regional Director
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Pacific Northwest Region

Date

/s/ C.L. "Butch" Otter

May 1, 2008

C.L. "Butch" Otter
Governor
State of Idaho

Date

#	PROJECT NAME	STATUS	BPA PROJECT No.	EXPENSE (\$)										
				2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
SALMON & STEELHEAD ESA PROJECTS: EXPENSE														
1	Upper Lemhi River Acquisition and Habitat Restoration: Acquisition	New			\$ 4,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,000,000
2	Upper Lemhi River Acquisition and Habitat Restoration: Restoration activities	New		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 3,200,000
3	Sockeye Conservation Hatchery Development: Planning *1	Expanded	200740200	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,000,000
4	Sockeye Conservation Hatchery Development: O&M	Expanded	200740200	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 717,500	\$ 735,437	\$ 753,823	\$ 772,669	\$ 791,985	\$ 811,785	\$ 832,080	\$ 6,215,279
5	Pahsimeroi River Habitat Project	New		\$ 700,000	\$ -	\$ 700,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 950,000	\$ 950,000	\$ 7,500,000
6	Water Transactions Fund	Expanded	200201301	\$ 700,000	\$ -	\$ 700,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 7,600,000
7	Lower Clearwater River/Potlatch River Watershed Management Plan Implementation	New		\$ 500,000		\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 5,000,000
8	Lower Lemhi River Habitat Restoration Project: Easements	New		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 2,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000
9	Lower Lemhi River Habitat Restoration Project: Habitat restoration	New		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 1,000,000
10	Nutrient Enhancement Project	New		\$ -	\$ -			\$ 333,333	\$ 333,333	\$ 333,333	\$ 333,333	\$ 333,333	\$ 333,333	\$ 1,999,998
11	Steelhead Viability Assessments for ESA Recovery Metrics *2	Expanded	199005500	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 1,500,000
YEARLY Totals:				\$ 2,550,000	\$ 4,750,000	\$ 7,875,000	\$ 5,892,500	\$ 6,743,770	\$ 6,762,156	\$ 4,531,002	\$ 4,550,318	\$ 4,170,118	\$ 4,190,413	\$ 52,015,277

*1 Additional funds to BPA's 07-09 decision to support the PA

*2 Additional funds to BPA's 07-09 decision to support the PA

#	PROJECT NAME ²	STATUS	BPA PROJECT No.	Capital (\$)											
				2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL	
SALMON & STEELHEAD ESA PROJECTS: CAPITAL															
12	Sockeye Conservation Hatchery Development: Purchase	Expanded	200740200	\$ 2,375,000	\$ 2,375,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,750,000
13	Sockeye Conservation Hatchery Development: Construction	Expanded	200740200	\$ -	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 5,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,500,000
YEARLY Totals:				\$ 2,375,000	\$ 5,375,000	\$ 5,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,250,000

ATTACHMENT B
IDAHO-BPA Project List
FOR IDAHO-ACTION AGENCY MOA
Upper Salmon and Clearwater Drainages

Priority	Project Title and Project Nos. as listed in Attachment A)	Project Description
1	Upper Lemhi River Acquisition and Habitat Restoration, Project Nos. 1 and 2	<p>This project would permanently protect and restore chinook and steelhead habitat in the upper Lemhi River Watershed through the acquisition and protection of appropriate habitats in the Upper Lemhi Watershed and through the implementation of on-the-ground habitat improvements.</p> <p>Idaho would seek to obtain property that includes the mainstem Lemhi River in the heart of Chinook salmon spawning and rearing habitat and/or several critical tributaries. The goal would be to obtain habitat that would provide :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year round access to up to 84 miles of previously inaccessible good quality spawning and rearing tributary habitat. • Up to an additional 190 miles of tributary habitat seasonally reconnected. • Up to 14 miles of mainstem Lemhi River and Big Springs Creek habitat upgraded via increased flows and riparian restoration. <p>The draft FCRPS BiOp (Table 3-a and 3-b in Attachment B.2.2-2 Tributary Habitat Action Tables) has listed the following limiting factors for Lemhi River chinook salmon and steelhead:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low stream flows 2. Water quality (high stream temperatures) 3. Fish passage (barriers and entrainment into irrigation ditches) 4. Substrate (sediment). <p>Table 5 in the draft FCRPS BiOp Habitat RPA’s identifies a 7% increase in freshwater survival for chinook salmon and 3% for steelhead for the 2007 – 2009 actions. However, the only BPA funded project identified in the draft BiOp currently implementing on-the-ground habitat projects in the Lemhi is the Fish Screening and Passage Improvements (The Screen Shop Program, BPA project 199401500).</p> <p>Specific actions designed to address the identified limiting factors and survival gaps include modifying, consolidating, and/or removing existing diversions to eliminate passage barriers and increase stream flow, installing fish screens on diversions, reconnecting tributaries, riparian habitat enhancement and fencing, culvert removal and/or replacement, instream habitat enhancement, channel reconfiguration, et al.</p>
2	Conservation Hatchery Development,	<p>This project would result in the acquisition and development of a new conservation hatchery facility designed to produce up to one million Snake River sockeye salmon smolts annually for reintroduction back to the habitat.</p>

ATTACHMENT B

	<p>Project Nos. 3, 4, 12 and 13</p>	<p>The flexibility to accommodate additional conservation hatchery programs as well as localized broodstock development programs would be incorporated into the design of the facility.</p> <p>The draft FCRPS (RPA Hatchery Strategy 2, Action 42) includes language specifically directing the Action Agencies to fund expansion of the safety-net program to increase sockeye salmon smolt releases to between 500,000 and 1 million fish annually.</p> <p>Anadromous adults that return to the program from increased reintroduction efforts will be used in controlled hatchery spawning events as well as released to the habitat to spawn naturally.</p>
<p align="center">3</p>	<p>Pahsimeroi River Habitat Project, Project No. 5</p>	<p>This project would permanently protect and restore chinook and steelhead habitat in the lower Pahsimeroi River Watershed (downstream of Big Creek).</p> <p>The draft FCRPS BiOp (Table 3-a and 3-b in Attachment B.2.2-2 Tributary Habitat Action Tables) has listed the following limiting factors for Pahsimeroi River chinook salmon and steelhead:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low stream flows 2. Water quality (high stream temperatures and excessive nutrients) 3. Fish passage (barriers and entrainment into irrigation ditches) 4. Substrate (sediment) 5. Poor riparian conditions (riparian area and LWD recruitment). <p>Table 5 in the draft FCRPS BiOp Habitat RPA’s identifies a 41% increase in freshwater survival for chinook salmon and 9% for steelhead resulting from the 2007 – 2009 actions.</p> <p>Specific actions designed to meet the identified limiting factors and survival improvements include conservation easements, acquisitions, modifying, consolidating, and/or removing existing diversions to eliminate passage barriers and increase stream flow, installing fish screens on diversions, reconnecting tributaries, riparian habitat enhancement and fencing, culvert removal and/or replacement, instream habitat enhancement, channel reconfiguration, spring, tributary, and mainstem channel restoration, et al.</p>
<p align="center">4</p>	<p>Water Transactions Fund, Project No. 6</p>	<p>This program will use the Idaho Water Resource Board (IWRB) expertise to develop projects to address the primary limiting factor in the Lemhi and Pahsimeroi Basins, the lack of flow. Projects would be selected to address the freshwater survival improvements stated in the Biological Opinion (7% for chinook and 3% for steelhead in the Lemhi Drainage and 41% for chinook and 9% for steelhead in the Pahsimeroi Drainage). The projects would also be coordinated with existing planning documents (Subbasin Plan, Lemhi Conservation Plan, Nez Perce Settlement, etc.) and USBWP tech team input.</p> <p>The program would provide water to reconnect tributaries in the Lemhi and Pahsimeroi as well as increase flow in mainstem Lemhi and Pahsimeroi</p>

ATTACHMENT B

		<p>reaches to improve fish passage conditions and increase the quantity and quality of habitat.</p> <p>The IWRB has developed experience acquiring water in the Upper Salmon Basin through participation in the Water Entity/Columbia Basin Water Transactions Program (BPA Project Number 200201301) with funding from BPA and the Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund. Water acquisition tools include short and long-term leases, permanent purchases, partial season leases, and diversion reduction agreements. The Board is also developing a sub-account in their Revolving Development Account to hold CBWTP-BPA funds for annual payments to irrigators. This mechanism provides financial accountability and IWRB coordination of policy and regulatory requirements necessary for effective water transactions.</p> <p>The program costs include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct and indirect transaction costs for water acquisitions (leases, agreements, associated fees and charges) • Program management and negotiations for developing transactions • Monitoring programs to document effectiveness of transactions.
<p align="center">5</p>	<p align="center">Lower Clearwater/Potlatch River Watershed Management Plan Implementation, Project No. 7</p>	<p>This project would accelerate the on-the-ground implementation of the recently completed Watershed Management Plan.</p> <p>Actions would focus on the primary limiting factors identified by NOAAF when it designated this watershed as the key watershed in the Clearwater for steelhead recovery and the limiting factors identified in the draft BiOp (Attachments B.2.2-2-Tributary Habitat Action Tables, Table 3-a. Snake river Steelhead 2007-2009 BPA Tributary Habitat Actions). These include: Riparian Areas and LWD Recruitment – impaired riparian condition and function; Stream substrate – elevated stream bed instability and elevated sediment; Floodplain connectivity and function – reduced floodplain connectivity, altered floodplain; and Channel structure.</p> <p>Specific actions designed to address these limiting factors include riparian and floodplain restoration and enhancement, riparian and floodplain conservation easements, acquisitions, reconnecting tributaries, removing migration barriers, instream habitat enhancement, summer streamflow improvement, et al.</p>
<p align="center">6</p>	<p align="center">Lower Lemhi River Habitat Restoration Project, Project Nos. 8 and 9</p>	<p>This project would permanently protect and restore chinook and steelhead habitat in the lower Lemhi River Watershed. The project would result in year round access to 66 miles of previously inaccessible good quality chinook and steelhead spawning and rearing habitat.</p> <p>The draft FCRPS BiOp (Table 3-a and 3-b in Attachment B.2.2-2 Tributary Habitat Action Tables) has listed the following limiting factors for Lemhi River chinook salmon and steelhead:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low stream flows Water quality (high stream temperatures) Fish passage (barriers and entrainment into irrigation ditches)

ATTACHMENT B

		<p>Substrate (sediment).</p> <p>Table 5 in the draft FCRPS BiOp Habitat RPA’s identifies a 7% increase in freshwater survival for chinook salmon and 3% for steelhead for the 2007 – 2009 actions. However, the only BPA funded project identified in the draft BiOp currently implementing on-the-ground habitat projects in the Lemhi is the Fish Screening and Passage Improvements (The Screen Shop Program, BPA project 199401500).</p> <p>Specific actions designed to meet the identified limiting factors and survival gaps include conservation easements, acquisitions, modifying, consolidating, and/or removing existing diversions to eliminate passage barriers and increase stream flow, installing fish screens on diversions, reconnecting tributaries, riparian habitat enhancement and fencing, culvert removal and/or replacement, instream habitat enhancement, channel reconfiguration, spring, tributary, and mainstem channel restoration, et al.</p>
<p>7</p>	<p>Nutrient Enhancement Project, Project No. 10</p>	<p>This project is a pilot study intended to pave the way for a larger-scale effort being spearheaded by NOAA scientists in collaboration with IDFG. The purpose of the larger study is to quantify the population-level benefits of nutrient addition and to determine the extent to which this technique can aid recovery.</p> <p>The objective of this project are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop the expertise and experience with commercially available nitrogen nutrient sources to conduct nutrient enhancement projects in Idaho and secondarily and 2. Determine if the addition of such nutrients can measurably increase chinook and steelhead productivity in central Idaho streams (to be determined). <p>Response variables include juvenile growth, density, and survival (to Lower Granite Dam and potentially to adult return). The approach will focus on release logistics and nutrient performance rather than fish monitoring. However, examination of a reduced set of fish parameters will enable a cursory evaluation of project success and lead the way for the more substantive assessments of larger proposed efforts. Ideally, this study would follow at least one year class of fish from emergence to emigration.</p> <p>This project will use a paired treatment/control approach on four streams in the Salmon or Clearwater river basins. Two streams will receive nutrients and two will serve as controls. Stream selection will involve preliminary measurement of stream chemistry to identify stream pairs with similar nutrient limitations. For this pilot study, we will target a 5-mile reach in streams with average summer flow of approximately 35 cfs.</p>
<p>8</p>	<p>Steelhead Viability Assessments for ESA Recovery Metrics, Project</p>	<p>This project focuses on status and trend monitoring of B-run steelhead populations in the Salmon and Clearwater drainages. The draft FCRPS BiOp has identified the need for additional monitoring for population productivity and abundance. RPA #50, bullet #5 states “Provide additional</p>

ATTACHMENT B

	No. 11	<p>status monitoring to ensure a majority of Snake River B-run steelhead populations are being monitored for population productivity and abundance.” An existing project (199005500) will be modified to incorporate the objective of providing steelhead population status information, coordinated through the ongoing collaboration process to develop a regional strategy for RME.</p> <p>This project will collect life history, genetic, and abundance data for, and assess the status of, wild steelhead populations in Idaho to adequately address recovery objectives associated with the ESA (Viable Salmonid Population criteria: abundance, spatial structure, productivity, diversity).</p>
--	--------	--